

WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

LIBERALITY.

BY H. J. COX.

"The liberal and shall be made fit."—Prov.

O let us waste wide

The blessing Heaven bestows,

And with the poor divide

The honey and the rose.

Why should we close our eyes

To human woe and grief?

Why not with heart and hand

And power thus relieve?

As we are made for good

To bless the poor and low

Who are our brethren here

And not our foes to fear.

"Whispering more than most,

In private words,

But giving a replete

With good to those who lend.

For 'tis but kind to God

Whose children are the poor;

He'll give a rich reward

In heaven and on earth.

Then let us scatter wide

The blessings Heaven bestows,

And with the poor divide

The honey and the rose.

MR. HALE ON ORGAN MUSIC.

The peculiar, almost unrivaled, combination

of wit, humor, good nature, and shrewd sense,

which characterize Mr. Hale, has rarely been

exhibited more effectively than in his short

speech on Printing, delivered on the 13th in

the Senate. The resolution under consideration

proposed to authorize the Committee on

Printing to contract with the publishers of the

Washington Union, for printing the Census

returns, on such terms as they might deem

reasonable. There had been a great deal of

vague talk and mystification on the subject,

but Mr. Hale cut directly to its core. He said:

"I want to say a word upon this subject, al-

though I enter upon it with great reluctance,

because the Senate will not be so easily

deceived, because, sir, we have been inter-

fering with the printing of the Census re-

turns, with such little effect, that it is

progressing so slowly, that it is a great

question whether it will be ready in time

for the President's inauguration. It is a

great question, and one which I am glad

to see brought before the Senate. It is a

question which I am glad to see brought

before the Senate. It is a question which

I am glad to see brought before the

Senate. It is a question which I am

glad to see brought before the Senate.

It is a question which I am glad to

see brought before the Senate. It is a

question which I am glad to see brought

before the Senate. It is a question which

I am glad to see brought before the

Senate. It is a question which I am

glad to see brought before the Senate.

It is a question which I am glad to

see brought before the Senate. It is a

question which I am glad to see brought

before the Senate. It is a question which

I am glad to see brought before the

Senate. It is a question which I am

glad to see brought before the Senate.

It is a question which I am glad to

see brought before the Senate. It is a

question which I am glad to see brought

before the Senate. It is a question which

I am glad to see brought before the

Senate. It is a question which I am

glad to see brought before the Senate.

It is a question which I am glad to

see brought before the Senate. It is a

question which I am glad to see brought

before the Senate. It is a question which

I am glad to see brought before the

Senate. It is a question which I am

glad to see brought before the Senate.

It is a question which I am glad to

see brought before the Senate. It is a

question which I am glad to see brought

before the Senate. It is a question which

I am glad to see brought before the

Senate. It is a question which I am

glad to see brought before the Senate.

ed at what he may be pleased to term the

trifling matter in which I have treated this

subject. I have not treated it triflingly. I am

in earnest. I speak what I think. I do not

impeach the motives of the Senator from

Indiana [Mr. Bright] or the Senator from

Connecticut [Mr. Smith]. I believe there is a

great deal of human nature in mankind generally,

and as much of it in those two Senators as

in the majority of high-minded men everywhere,

and no more than that, and seeing that

manifest destiny points to the Union press

as the one to do this printing, why let us bow

to this manifest destiny, and let them have it,

and not stand so much time in discussion.

I hope I have given a rational view of this

subject, and that will commend itself to sense

in all around the Senate; and they will

be glad to meet the question at once, and

vote upon it.

There is a passage in the speech of Senator

Downs, of Louisiana, delivered a few days

since, which shows how terribly the North

oppressed the South. He says:

"I proceed now to his arguments on the

He opens this branch of his subject by a

denunciation of Southern pusillanimity, of which

he speaks as flippantly and as coolly as if he

had the sole right to rule in questions of honor

and propriety for our portion of the Union,

and as if his doctrines had not been repudiated

by all the most patriotic and distinguished

men of the South, and in his own State, and

then proceeds to the argument by an assumption

as little sustained by our past history as

any that was ever made, perhaps, on this floor.

He said:

"The policy of the Union is under the control

of Northern sentiments and Northern in-

terests."

Let us see how a few facts in our history

will show the incorrectness of this assumption.

The commander-in-chief of the army of the

Revolution, General Washington, the first

President of the United States, was a Virginian,

and an extensive seacoast had been acquired

in the South (embracing, too, the great outlet

of the valley of the Mississippi) greater than

our whole extent of coast at the close of the

Revolution, and the great outlet had been

acquired in the North, on the Atlantic. Of the

Presidents elected, seven were from the South

and four from the North; five from the North

served two terms—not one from the North.

The South has had the Presidency nearly fifty

out of sixty-four years that the present Govern-

ment has been in power. The President of the

Supreme Court has been a Virginian for

more than half a century continuously.

As it was in the past, so it is in the present.

A Southern man presides here, and in the other

House, and did during the last Congress;

the chairman of the most important committee

in this and the other House are Southern men;

the commander-in-chief of the army is a

native of the South; all three of the commanders

in the war with Mexico were natives, and two

of the results of the South.

I notice these things in a boastful spirit;

they were, I know, brought about without

design, in the natural course of events, but

they certainly go far to show that the South

are not that oppressed people which some

men represent them to be.

For the double purpose of illustrating the

opinion I have here advanced, and to show

that Mr. Jefferson rejected with horror such

violent remedies for injuries to the South as

the Senator has been propagating, I beg leave

to read an extract from a speech delivered by

him, more than a quarter of a century since,

(1825) Mr. Jefferson (I need only say to

him, his name is enough) thought there was

at least as much reason to complain of the

such stands here before the country, the first

of the country, and yet the President

champion of the South, and no other man

from the Old World that could be said to

personify it. That is the highest claim which

he has upon my regard, and as I believe, upon

the regard of the civilized world. What was

the case of the South, seven hundred years

ago? She had a powerful and a confederated

empire; she had her own rights, and guarded

with jealous care; and she had her separate

State independence and sovereignty, which

perished through the encroachments of the

central power—a power created under ex-

pressive and unconstitutional measures. If

this Republic should go the downward

path which every republic has gone

whose history has been written, from what

cause will it perish? I stand here to welcome

Louis Kossuth because I love this Union, and

pray that it may be eternal; but I see in this

Government no prospect of immortality, and

what is it? If this Government shall perish

it will perish by the encroachments of the

central power upon the rights of the separate

States. And here stands a man whose whole

life has been devoted to the vindication of State

rights against a consolidation and centralization

of the principle of the Union, and it is for

that we should welcome him here, if we welcome

him at all—as I trust we shall do cheerfully,

and with our whole hearts.

Now, what is the reason why liberty has been

broken down in Europe from the earliest

times, and why it is so in this country, and

why they have no confidence there for dividing

the powers of the Government among many

different administrations? How was it that

that great man—the apostle of liberty in two

worlds—and his compatriots failed to establish

constitutional government in France? Why is

the Republic of France so weak and so

timid? For one reason, and one only; and that is,

because all the powers of the Government are

entrusted to one central power. And that power

is not of necessity be altogether too strong

for liberty to exist anywhere.

And sir, when I see here in this country the

universal tendency of power to attract to itself

all power, when I see there must, some day or

other, come up the question, shall this cluster

of Republics cease to be a cluster of Republics?

Shall it become a National Government? When

I see a man in the Union come forward, who

because it carries national powers further than

other men are disposed to carry them; when I

see such tendencies—I allude not to the present

particularly, but to different periods since the

foundation of our Government—when I see that

this is the general tendency of the country, I

feel that the country ought to contend, who

desires the preservation of the Republic.

When I see a man in the Union come forward,

who because it carries national powers further

than other men are disposed to carry them; when

I see such tendencies—I allude not to the present

particularly, but to different periods since the

foundation of our Government—when I see that

this is the general tendency of the country, I

feel that the country ought to contend, who

desires the preservation of the Republic.

When I see a man in the Union come forward,

who because it carries national powers further

than other men are disposed to carry them; when

I see such tendencies—I allude not to the present

particularly, but to different periods since the

foundation of our Government—when I see that

this is the general tendency of the country, I

feel that the country ought to contend, who

desires the preservation of the Republic.

Fugitive Slave Law, and on this ground make

no exception to it, and yet the President

champion of the South, and no other man

from the Old World that could be said to

personify it. That is the highest claim which

he has upon my regard, and as I believe, upon

the regard of the civilized world. What was

the case of the South, seven hundred years

ago? She had a powerful and a confederated

empire; she had her own rights, and guarded

with jealous care; and she had her separate

State independence and sovereignty, which

perished through the encroachments of the

central power—a power created under ex-

pressive and unconstitutional measures. If

this Republic should go the downward

path which every republic has gone

whose history has been written, from what

cause will it perish? I stand here to welcome

Louis Kossuth because I love this Union, and

pray that it may be eternal; but I see in this

Government no prospect of immortality, and

what is it? If this Government shall perish

it will perish by the encroachments of the

central power upon the rights of the separate

States. And here stands a man whose whole

life has been devoted to the vindication of State

rights against a consolidation and centralization

of the principle of the Union, and it is for

that we should welcome him here, if we welcome

him at all—as I trust we shall do cheerfully,

and with our whole hearts.

Now, what is the reason why liberty has been

broken down in Europe from the earliest

times, and why it is so in this country, and

why they have no confidence there for dividing

the powers of the Government among many

different administrations? How was it that

that great man—the apostle of liberty in two

worlds—and his compatriots failed to establish

constitutional government in France? Why is